

**REMARKS**

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1-19 are pending and under consideration. No new matter is presented in this Amendment.

**REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §101:**

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the Examiner cites paragraph [0039] of the specification and states that claim 17 is drawn to a carrier wave. However, the Applicants respectfully note that the Examiner has referred to the specification as originally filed, and not the specification on the record (per the Amendment filed by the Applicants on July 3, 2007). The Amendment filed by the Applicants amended the specification to read, "The computer-readable recording medium includes a magnetic storing medium (for example, a ROM, a floppy disk, a hard disk, etc.) and an optical reader (for example, a CD-ROM, a DVD, etc.). Aspects of the present invention can also be realized as a computer data signal embodied in a carrier wave comprising a compression source code segment comprising the code and an encryption source code segment comprising the code (such as data transmission through the Internet)." Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully clarify that paragraph [0039], in fact, does not list a carrier wave as an example of a recording medium. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

**REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:**

Claims 1-4, 6, 9-12, 14, 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Yamanaka et al. (U.S. Patent 5,983,247), hereinafter "Yamanaka." The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request reconsideration.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 1, it is noted that claim 1 recites an apparatus for displaying browser graphics that "stores browser graphics off different aspects ratios" and "selects a browser graphic" corresponding to an extracted aspect ratio from among the stored plurality of browser graphics. In contrast, as the Applicants stated in the amendment filed December 4, 2007, Yamanaka does not suggest a storing of a plurality of browser graphics, and a selection of a browser graphic corresponding to an aspect ratio from among the plurality of

browser graphics. Rather, Yamanaka only suggests converting a graphic image to have a proper aspect ratio (column 2, lines 7-14). On page 3 of the Office Action mailed February 19, 2008, the Examiner states that each of the plurality of storage areas of the area storage unit (column 2, lines 5-7) stores an image of a different aspect ratio. The Applicants respectfully disagree. The Applicants note that Yamanaka teaches a method whereby one converted image is generated for each received image to have a specific aspect ratio according to conversion information (column 2, lines 10-14). That is, a plurality of converted images, each having a different aspect ratio, is not generated for a received image. Rather, one converted image, having a specific aspect ratio, is generated for a received image. While the plurality of storage areas cited by the Examiner stores a plurality of converted images, the Applicants respectfully clarify that each stored, converted image corresponds to a different received image. That is, according to the method taught by Yamanaka, an unprocessed HTML document is analyzed, and each image and character string in the HTML document is converted one-by-one (column 16, lines 16-59). Accordingly, each of the converted images and character strings is stored in a respective one of the plurality of storage areas (column 16, lines 37-47; and column 17, lines 64-67). To clarify, the plurality of storage areas does not store a plurality of the same image with different aspect ratios. Rather, only one converted image for each received image is stored. Thus, Yamanaka also does not teach a selection of an image with a desired aspect ratio from among a plurality of stored images having different aspect ratios. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that Yamanaka fails to disclose, implicitly or explicitly, a storing of browser graphics with different aspect ratios and a selecting of a browser graphic from among the stored browser graphics, as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, as the current arguments are a clarification of the arguments presented in the Amendment filed December 4, 2007, the Applicants respectfully submit that no new issues are raised in the current Amendment.

Regarding the rejection of claims 2-4 and 6, it is noted that these claims depend from claim 1 and are, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons set forth above.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 9, it is noted that claim 9 recites a "storing [of] browser graphics with different aspect ratios" and "selecting a browser graphic" corresponding to an extracted aspect ratio from among the stored browser graphics. In contrast, as the Applicants stated in the amendment filed December 4, 2007, Yamanaka does not suggest a storing of a plurality of browser graphics, and a selection of a browser graphic corresponding to an aspect ratio from among the plurality of browser graphics. Rather, Yamanaka only suggests converting a graphic image to have a proper aspect ratio (column 2,

lines 7-14). On page 3 of the Office Action mailed February 19, 2008, the Examiner states that each of the plurality of storage areas of the area storage unit (column 2, lines 5-7) stores an image of a different aspect ratio. The Applicants respectfully disagree. The Applicants note that Yamanaka teaches a method whereby one converted image is generated for each received image to have a specific aspect ratio according to conversion information (column 2, lines 10-14). That is, a plurality of converted images, each having a different aspect ratio, is not generated for a received image. Rather, one converted image, having a specific aspect ratio, is generated for a received image. While the plurality of storage areas cited by the Examiner stores a plurality of converted images, the Applicants respectfully clarify that each stored, converted image corresponds to a different received image. That is, according to the method taught by Yamanaka, an unprocessed HTML document is analyzed, and each image and character string in the HTML document is converted one-by-one (column 16, lines 16-59). Accordingly, each of the converted images and character strings is stored in a respective one of the plurality of storage areas (column 16, lines 37-47; and column 17, lines 64-67). To clarify, the plurality of storage areas does not store a plurality of the same image with different aspect ratios. Rather, only one converted image for each received image is stored. Thus, Yamanaka also does not teach a selection of an image with a desired aspect ratio from among a plurality of stored images having different aspect ratios. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that Yamanaka fails to disclose, implicitly or explicitly, a storing of browser graphics with different aspect ratios and a selecting of a browser graphic from among the stored browser graphics, as recited in claim 9. Furthermore, as the current arguments are a clarification of the arguments presented in the Amendment filed December 4, 2007, the Applicants respectfully submit that no new issues are raised in the current Amendment.

Regarding the rejection of claims 10-12 and 14, it is noted that these claims depend from claim 9 and are, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons set forth above.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 17, it is noted that claim 17 recites a "storing [of] browser graphics with different aspect ratios" and "selecting a browser graphic" corresponding to an extracted aspect ratio from among the stored browser graphics. In contrast, as the Applicants stated in the amendment filed December 4, 2007, Yamanaka does not suggest a storing of a plurality of browser graphics, and a selection of a browser graphic corresponding to an aspect ratio from among the plurality of browser graphics. Rather, Yamanaka only suggests converting a graphic image to have a proper aspect ratio (column 2, lines 7-14). On page 3 of the Office Action mailed February 19, 2008, the Examiner states that

each of the plurality of storage areas of the area storage unit (column 2, lines 5-7) stores an image of a different aspect ratio. The Applicants respectfully disagree. The Applicants note that Yamanaka teaches a method whereby one converted image is generated for each received image to have a specific aspect ratio according to conversion information (column 2, lines 10-14). That is, a plurality of converted images, each having a different aspect ratio, is not generated for a received image. Rather, one converted image, having a specific aspect ratio, is generated for a received image. While the plurality of storage areas cited by the Examiner stores a plurality of converted images, the Applicants respectfully clarify that each stored, converted image corresponds to a different received image. That is, according to the method taught by Yamanaka, an unprocessed HTML document is analyzed, and each image and character string in the HTML document is converted one-by-one (column 16, lines 16-59). Accordingly, each of the converted images and character strings is stored in a respective one of the plurality of storage areas (column 16, lines 37-47; and column 17, lines 64-67). To clarify, the plurality of storage areas does not store a plurality of the same image with different aspect ratios. Rather, only one converted image for each received image is stored. Thus, Yamanaka also does not teach a selection of an image with a desired aspect ratio from among a plurality of stored images having different aspect ratios. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that Yamanaka fails to disclose, implicitly or explicitly, a storing of browser graphics with different aspect ratios and a selecting of a browser graphic from among the stored browser graphics, as recited in claim 17. Furthermore, as the current arguments are a clarification of the arguments presented in the Amendment filed December 4, 2007, the Applicants respectfully submit that no new issues are raised in the current Amendment.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 19, it is noted that claim 19 recites "a selection of a browser graphic, corresponding to the browser graphic aspect ratio information, from among a plurality of browser graphics, having different aspect ratios." In contrast, as the Applicants stated in the amendment filed December 4, 2007, Yamanaka does not suggest a storing of a plurality of browser graphics, and a selection of a browser graphic corresponding to an aspect ratio from among the plurality of browser graphics. Rather, Yamanaka only suggests converting a graphic image to have a proper aspect ratio (column 2, lines 7-14). On page 3 of the Office Action mailed February 19, 2008, the Examiner states that each of the plurality of storage areas of the area storage unit (column 2, lines 5-7) stores an image of a different aspect ratio. The Applicants respectfully disagree. The Applicants note that Yamanaka teaches a method whereby one converted image is generated for each received image to have a specific

aspect ratio according to conversion information (column 2, lines 10-14). That is, a plurality of converted images, each having a different aspect ratio, is not generated for a received image. Rather, one converted image, having a specific aspect ratio, is generated for a received image. While the plurality of storage areas cited by the Examiner stores a plurality of converted images, the Applicants respectfully clarify that each stored, converted image corresponds to a different received image. That is, according to the method taught by Yamanaka, an unprocessed HTML document is analyzed, and each image and character string in the HTML document is converted one-by-one (column 16, lines 16-59). Accordingly, each of the converted images and character strings is stored in a respective one of the plurality of storage areas (column 16, lines 37-47; and column 17, lines 64-67). To clarify, the plurality of storage areas does not store a plurality of the same image with different aspect ratios. Rather, only one converted image for each received image is stored. Thus, Yamanaka also does not teach a selection of an image with a desired aspect ratio from among a plurality of stored images having different aspect ratios. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that Yamanaka fails to disclose, implicitly or explicitly, a storing of browser graphics with different aspect ratios and a selecting of a browser graphic from among the stored browser graphics, as recited in claim 19. Furthermore, as the current arguments are a clarification of the arguments presented in the Amendment filed December 4, 2007, the Applicants respectfully submit that no new issues are raised in the current Amendment.

**REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:**

Claims 5 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamanaka et al. in view of Graham (HTML Source Book). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request reconsideration.

Regarding the rejection of claim 5, it is noted that this claim depends from claim 4 and is, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons set forth above.

Regarding the rejection of claim 13, it is noted that this claim depends from claim 12 and is, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claims 7, 15 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamanaka et al. in view of Ellson et al. (U.S. Patent 5,455,902), hereinafter "Ellson." The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request reconsideration.

Regarding the rejection of claim 7, it is noted that this claim depends from claim 1 and is,

therefore, allowable for at least the reasons set forth above.

Regarding the rejection of claim 15, it is noted that this claim depends from claim 9 and is, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons set forth above.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 18, it is noted that claim 18 recites a selecting of a "browser graphic from among a plurality of browser graphics having different display aspect ratios, such that a display aspect ratio of the browser graphic corresponds to a display device type displaying the browser graphic." In contrast, as the Applicants stated in the amendment filed December 4, 2007, neither Yamanaka nor Ellson suggests a storing of a plurality of browser graphics, and a selection of a browser graphic corresponding to an aspect ratio from among the plurality of browser graphics. Rather, Yamanaka only suggests converting a graphic image to have a proper aspect ratio (column 2, lines 7-14), and Ellson suggests converting a graphic image to have a selected aspect ratio (column 7, lines 7-14). On page 3 of the Office Action mailed February 19, 2008, the Examiner states that each of the plurality of storage areas of the area storage unit (column 2, lines 5-7) stores an image of a different aspect ratio. The Applicants respectfully disagree. The Applicants note that Yamanaka teaches a method whereby one converted image is generated for each received image to have a specific aspect ratio according to conversion information (column 2, lines 10-14). That is, a plurality of converted images, each having a different aspect ratio, is not generated for a received image. Rather, one converted image, having a specific aspect ratio, is generated for a received image. While the plurality of storage areas cited by the Examiner stores a plurality of converted images, the Applicants respectfully clarify that each stored, converted image corresponds to a different received image. That is, according to the method taught by Yamanaka, an unprocessed HTML document is analyzed, and each image and character string in the HTML document is converted one-by-one (column 16, lines 16-59). Accordingly, each of the converted images and character strings is stored in a respective one of the plurality of storage areas (column 16, lines 37-47; and column 17, lines 64-67). To clarify, the plurality of storage areas does not store a plurality of the same image with different aspect ratios. Rather, only one converted image for each received image is stored. Thus, Yamanaka also does not teach a selection of an image with a desired aspect ratio from among a plurality of stored images having different aspect ratios. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that Yamanaka in view of Ellson fails to disclose, implicitly or explicitly, a storing of browser graphics with different aspect ratios and a selecting of a browser graphic from among the stored browser graphics, as recited in claim 19. Furthermore, as the current arguments are a clarification of the arguments presented in the Amendment filed

December 4, 2007, the Applicants respectfully submit that no new issues are raised in the current Amendment.

Claims 8 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamanaka et al. in view of Nolan et al. (U.S. Patent 6,049,316). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request reconsideration.

Regarding the rejection of claim 8, it is noted that this claim depends from claim 2 and is, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons set forth above.

Regarding the rejection of claim 16, it is noted that this claim depends from claim 10 and is, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons set forth above.

Based on the foregoing, this rejection is respectfully requested to be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION:**

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

4/17/08

By: \_\_\_\_\_



Michael D. Stein  
Registration No. 37,240

1400 Eye St., N.W.  
Suite 300  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 216-9505  
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510